

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,424	10/07/2003	Hideo Eda	001309.00048	3473
22907	7590 10/02/2006		EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF 1001 G STREET N W			SMITH, RUTH S	
SUITE 1100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20001		3737	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
		10/679,424	EDA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
-		Ruth S. Smith	3737			
The MAIL Period for Reply	NG DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover she	eet with the correspondence a	ddress		
WHICHEVER IS - Extensions of time mater SIX (6) MONTH: - If NO period for reply - Failure to reply within Any reply received by	STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ay be available under the provisions of 37 CFR from the mailing date of this communication is specified above, the maximum statutory peri the set or extended period for reply will, by sta the Office later than three months after the ma djustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMM 1.136(a). In no event, however, n and will apply and will expire SIX (6 tute. cause the application to become	IUNICATION. nay a reply be timely filed i) MONTHS from the mailing date of this of the ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)			
Status						
1) Responsive	e to communication(s) filed on <u>07</u>	October 2003.				
2a) This action		nis action is non-final.				
3) Since this a	this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Clain			,			
4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-18 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
10) The drawing Applicant ma	eation is objected to by the Examing(s) filed on is/are: a) and a sy not request that any objection to the drawing sheet(s) including the corrupted declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objectene drawing(s) be held in ab ection is required if the dra	peyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). wing(s) is objected to. See 37 C			
Priority under 35 U.	S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of Reference 2) Notice of Draftspers 3) Information Disclosi Paper No(s)/Mail Da S Patent and Trademark Office S Patent and Trademark Office S Patent and Trademark Office	on's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Pape 5) <u> </u>	view Summary (PTO-413) rr No(s)/Mail Date ce of Informal Patent Application r:			

Application/Control Number: 10/679,424

Art Unit: 3737

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-7,12-14, drawn to a method of imaging, classified in class 600, subclass 411.
- II. Claims 8-11,15-18, drawn to a molded headgear, classified in class 249, subclass 53R.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the headgear can be used in either a treatment method or a non-medical method.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Susan Wolffe on September 19, 2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Art Unit: 3737

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruth S. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4745. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM-4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ruth S. Smith Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3737